

Appln No. 10/677,994

Amdt date May 6, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested. Claims 6, 15, 17, 24 and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 12, 16, 18, 20 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16 and 18-23 are now pending in the application.

Applicants note that the Examiner has not acknowledged the information disclosure statement submitted on February 9, 2005 by returning an initialed copy of form PTO/SB/08A/B. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge this IDS. An additional copy of the IDS may be submitted for the Examiner's convenience upon request.

I. Objections to the Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the format of the Abstract of the disclosure. Applicants have submitted a replacement Abstract herewith on a separate sheet of paper. The length of the Abstract has been reduced and an effort has been made to remove legal phraseology and repetitive information. Entry of the new Abstract is requested. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract are requested.

II. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification for allegedly including informalities. Applicants have amended the specification as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly,

Appln No. 10/677,994
Amdt date May 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of February 25, 2005

reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification are requested.

III. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-5, 12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Yu (US Patent 5,081,621). In addition, the Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 13 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yu in view of Oliphant et al. (US Patent 6,483,712).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12 and 20 to include the elements of dependent claims 6, 17 and 24, respectively. The Examiner indicated in the Office action mailed February 25, 2005 that claims 6, 7, 17, 18 and 24 contained allowable subject matter and would be allowed if amended to be in independent form. Amended claims 1, 12 and 20 now correspond to such independent claims based on claims 6, 17 and 24. Thus, Applicants believe claims 1, 12 and 20 are in condition for allowance and such action is requested at the earliest possible date.

In addition, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 18 to be in independent form. The remaining claims 2-5, 8-11, 13-16, and 21-23 depend from independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and incorporate the limitations therein, in addition to other limitations in each of these claims, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to amended independent claims 1, 12 and 20, Applicants believe these

Appln No. 10/677,994

Amdt date May 6, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2005

dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation and obviousness rejections of all pending claims are requested.

Appln No. 10/677,994

Amdt date May 6, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-5, 7-14, 16 and 18-23, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (626) 795-9900.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Jonathan S. Miller

Reg. No. 48,534

626/795-9900

CAH PAS617063.1-*--05/6/05 8:38 AM